Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with th correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 October 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-38_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-38_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   This action is in response to the application filed 10/30/01.

2.   Claims 1 – 38 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4.   Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11, 12, 14 – 19, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 34, 36 – 38 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Althoff et al. USPN 6,374,252 B1.

Regarding Claims 1 & 29, Althoff anticipates a method for processing object
property changes;

the method comprising:

obtaining a request to process at least one object property change, the request
corresponding to a software application object (7:10 – 15);

initiating a property change defer cycle (21: 12 – 21, as interpreted see

transaction begin and end for all changes (multiple changes or batch, also see lines 22

– 27, for specifying order of execution).

processing the at least one object property change (21: 12 – 21, see change to

database model also see 7: 53 – 55, which defines the database model as comprising

editable objects);

determining the end of the property change defer cycle (21: 12 – 21, , see transaction end);

implementing the processed at least one object property change upon the determination of the end of the property change defer cycle (21:18 – 21, see operations being committed to when transaction end is invoked].

Regarding Claims 2 & 30, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request to process at least one object property change is transmitted by the software application (8:47 – 50).

Regarding Claims 3 & 31, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request to process at least one object property change includes obtaining;

a request to process multiple property changes (31:27 – 30, see edit searchable properties and multiple at once).

Regarding Claims 5 & 21, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein processing the at least one object property change includes associating a property change group category to the at least one object property change (Althoff, FIG. 4, 411).

Regarding Claims 6 & 22, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein processing the at least one object property change includes generating a property change group memory array, the property change group memory array including array elements corresponding to an object associated with the property change request (Althoff, 28:7 – 10, " when large numbers of rows are to be selected from a table (for example a group), the system attempts to fetch those rows into an array, for faster retrieval").

Regarding Claim 7, the method as recited in Claim 6, wherein processing the at least one object property change includes populating the property change group memory array with the property change group category associated with the at least one object property change (Althoff, 28:7 – 10, see array fetching).

Regarding Claim 8, the method as recited in Claim 6, wherein processing the at least one object property change includes populating the property change group memory array with every object property change obtained in the property change request (Althoff, 28:7 – 11).

Regarding Claim 9, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein processing the at least one object property change includes identifying additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the property changes obtained in the property change request (Althoff, 26: 1 – 5).

Regarding claim 11, the method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising prior to determining the end of the property change defer cycle:

determining whether additional software application work is required;

if additional software application work is required, initiating a second property change defer cycle (Althoff, 26: 1 – 5);

processing any additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the additional software application work; and determining the end of the second property change defer cycle (Althoff, 26: 1 – 5).

Regarding Claims 12 & 34, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein determining the end of the property change defer cycle includes obtaining a request from the software application to terminate the property change defer cycle (Althoff, 21:13 – 15).

Regarding Claims 14 & 36, the method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request to process at least one object property change includes a request to process at least one software application user interface object (Althoff, 20:30 – 35, see graphics object).

Regarding Claim 15, the computer-readable version of Claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 16, the system version of Claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 17, the system version of Claim 1, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 18, the method as recited in Claim 17, wherein the request to process at least one object property change corresponding to a display object includes obtaining a request to process multiple property changes corresponding to a display object (20:30 – 35, see graphics object, also see 21: 12 – 20, for atomic transactions).

Regarding claim 19, the method as recited in Claim 17, wherein the request to process at least one object property change corresponding to a display object includes obtaining a request to process multiple property changes corresponding to multiple display objects (21: 12 – 20, for atomic transactions and all changes to user database model).

Regarding Claim 23, which recites similarly as previously discussed Claim 11 see rationale above.

Regarding Claim 24, which recites similarly as previously discussed Claim 12 see rationale above.

Regarding Claim 26, which recites similarly as previously discussed Claim 18 see rationale above.

Regarding Claim 27, the computer readable version of Claim 17, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 28, the system version of Claim 17, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 37, the computer readable version of Claim 29, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Regarding Claim 38, the system version of Claim 29, see rationale above as previously discussed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claim 4,10,13,20,25,32,33, & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Althoff et al. USPN 6,374,252 B1 (hereinafter "Althoff") as applied in

claims 1, 17 and 29, in view of Shetyn USPN 6,499,062 (hereinafter "Shetyn").

Regarding Claims 4, 20 & 32, Althoff discloses all the claimed limitations as

applied in claims 1, 17 & 29. Although, Althoff does disclose an atomic transaction

which includes a begin and end transaction for collecting and performing all changes,

which Examiner has interpreted to be equivalent to Applicant's defer cycle limitation,

Althoff doesn't explicitly disclose wherein initiating the property change defer cycle

includes incrementing a property change defer cycle counter. However, Shetyn in an

analogous art does teach in 8:50 – 60 delay objects (defer cycle), which are used to

start counting and calculate delay object changes. Therefore it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shetyn's teachings off delay objects

(defer cycle) and as well as counting using timers with Althoff, because, " it enables the

user to create a macro" (Shetyn, 8:58 - 62) and macro's typical shorten the program and

improve time and programming over head.

Regarding Claims 10 & 33, Shetyn further discloses the method as recited in

Claim 9 further comprising, prior to determining the end of the property change defer

cycle:

initiating a second property change defer cycle (Shetyn, 8:50 – 55, see third

route);

processing any additional property changes corresponding to the implementation

of the property changes obtained in the property change request (Shetyn, 8:50 – 55);

and

determining the end of the second property change defer cycle (Shetyn, 8:52 –

58).

Regarding Claims 13, 25 & 35, Althoff discloses all the claimed limitations as

applied in claims 1, 17 and 29. Although, Althoff does disclose an atomic transaction

which includes a begin and end transaction for collecting and performing all changes,

which Examiner has interpreted to be equivalent to Applicant's defer cycle limitation,

Althoff doesn't explicitly disclose wherein determining the end of the property change defer cycle includes the expiration of a defined time period. However, Shetyn in an analogous art does teach in 8:52 – 55 delay objects (defer cycle), which are used to start counting and calculate delay object changes (see time specified in delay object). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Shetyn's teachings of counting and calculating delay object changes including the time which is specified within the delay object with Althoff, because, " it enables the user to create a macro" (Shetyn, 8:58 - 62) and macro's typical shorten the program and improve time and programming over head.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-2723698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-2723695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER